

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant thanks Examiner for the detailed Office Action dated February 27, 2008. In response to the issues raised, the Applicant offers the following submissions and amendments. We also enclose a Terminal Disclaimer linking the term and ownership of any patent granted on the present application to that of co-pending application USSN 10/803,077 and patent US 7,040,823.

### **Amendments**

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the features defined in original claims 7 and 31. The amended claim also clarifies that the display device a stand alone device that is separate from the computer providing it with images for display. Accordingly, claim 7 has been cancelled and claim 31 has been significantly amended.

Claim 6 has been amended to clarify that the computer system incorporates the computer.

Claims 8, 9 and 10 have been amended to depend from claim 1 instead of cancelled claim 6.

Claims 29 and 30 have been cancelled.

Claims 31 to 35 have been amended to delete elements previously defined in claim 1.

Accordingly, the claims do not add any new matter.

### **Non-Statutory Double Patenting**

We submit that the enclosed Terminal Disclaimers prevent any unjustified timewise extension of exclusive rights or harassment from multiple assignees.

### **Claims – 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1, 3, 6 to 16, 18, 21 to 24, 27 to 30, 32 and 33 stand rejected as obvious in light of US 6,120,127 to Inoue et al, in view of US 6,973,518 to Purpura.

Amended claim 1 is limited to a display device with a stand that supports a flat panel display and a printer for operation at a position remote from the computer providing it with images for display. This clarifies that the invention is directed to a display that is a separate 'stand alone' device. Providing a flat panel monitor that can print makes retrieval of any hard copies convenient for the user while not consuming any additional desk space. Restricting claim 1 to a display that prints data received from a computer via a connection, excludes the laptop with inbuilt printer shown in Inoue. The display unit 3313 is clearly not detachable from the processor body 3301 and the user is unable to use the keyboard while the printer is printing as this would obstruct the collection tray 3312A.

Purpura discusses a docking station for configuring airline passengers' laptops prior to boarding and using the onboard network and peripherals. There is no suggestion of a stand alone display with pagewidth printhead.

In light of the above, Inoue and Purpura do not teach all the elements of amended claim 1. Accordingly, claims 1, 3, 6 to 16, 18, 21 to 24, 27 to 30, 32 and 33 are not obvious in light of the cited references.

Claims 2 and 19 stand rejected as obvious in light of Inoue and Purpura in further view of US 6,593,944 to Nicolas et al. As discussed above, Inoue and Purpura do not disclose a display device with a stand that supports a flat panel display and a printer for operation at a position remote from the computer providing it with images for display. Similarly, Nicolas is also silent as to a display device with this combination of features.

Claim 4 stands rejected as obvious in light of Inoue and Purpura in further view of US 6,086,185 to Inui et al. As discussed above, Inoue and Purpura do not disclose a display device with a stand that supports a flat panel display and a printer for operation at a position remote from the computer providing it with images for display. Similarly, Inui is also silent as to a display device with this combination of features.

Claims 5, 17, 20 and 34 stand rejected as obvious in light of Inoue and Purpura in further view of US 5,984,446 to Silverbrook. As discussed above, Inoue and Purpura do not disclose a display device with a stand that supports a flat panel display and a printer for operation at a position remote from the computer providing it with images for display. Similarly, Silverbrook is also silent as to a display device with this combination of features.

Claims 25 and 26 stand rejected as obvious in light of Inoue and Purpura in further view of US 6,771,388 to Morikawa et al. As discussed above, Inoue and Purpura do not disclose a display device with a stand that supports a flat panel display and a printer for operation at a position remote from the computer providing it with images for display. Similarly, Morikawa is also silent as to a display device with this combination of features.

Claim 31 stands rejected as obvious in light of Inoue and Purpura in further view of US 7,003,279 to Nickum. As discussed above, Inoue and Purpura do not disclose a display device with a stand that supports a flat panel display and a printer for operation at a position remote from the computer providing it with images for display. Similarly, Nickum is also silent as to a display device with this combination of features.

Claim 35 stands rejected as obvious in light of Inoue and Purpura in further view of US published application 2003/0197887 to Shenoy. As discussed above, Inoue and Purpura do not disclose a display device with a stand that supports a flat panel display and a printer for operation at a position remote from the computer providing it with images for display. Similarly, Shenoy is also silent as to a display device with this combination of features.

As amended claim 1 is the sole independent claim, it follows from the above that the dependent claims are non-obvious in light of the cited references.

#### Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejections have been successfully traversed and the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,  
Applicant/s:



---

Kia Silverbrook

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia  
Email: [kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com](mailto:kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com)  
Telephone: +612 9818 6633  
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762